

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

10-6-2018

## Faculty Senate Chronicle September 6, 2018

Heather Howley

*University of Akron*, [hhowley@uakron.edu](mailto:hhowley@uakron.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>  
Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

### Recommended Citation

Howley, Heather. "Faculty Senate Chronicle September 6, 2018." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 6 Oct 2018. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/155>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



September 6, 2018

15 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

1. Adopted a resolution from the General Education Advisory Committee approving a course for the new general education requirement.
2. Elected the following persons to the offices listed below: Faculty Senate Vice Chair: Nidaa Makki; Faculty Senate Secretary: Heather Howley Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members: Stacey Nofziger and Pam Schulze for 1-year terms and Michele Thornton and Jeanne Helene Roy for 2-year terms. Graduate Council Representatives: Claire Tessier and Mark Soucek University Council 2-year term: Edward Evans

## Table of Contents

Minutes of Faculty Senate meeting held September 6, 2018.....	3
Appendices to Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting held on September 6, 2018	
A. Questions for Reorganization (Referenced by President Green).....	14
B. Report of the General Education Advisory Committee.....	15

## MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2018

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, September 6, 2018 in room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. Senate Chair Linda Saliga called the meeting to order at 3:03pm.

Of the current roster of 61 senators, 46 attended the meeting. Senators Budd, Hariots, McKnight, Schulze, Scotto and Xi were absent with notice. Senators Barry, Bean, Bennington, Bible, Braun Cargill, Soucek, Szalay and Wang were absent without notice.

### *I. Adoption of Agenda*

On Senator Nofziger's motion, the agenda was adopted as amended by Chair Saliga without dissent.

### *II. Adoption of Minutes of May 3, 2018 Meeting*

On Senator Roy's motion, the minutes were adopted without dissent.

### *III. Remarks of the Chair*

Chair Saliga remarked:

Welcome to the first meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2018-2019 academic year.

I would like to introduce our newly elected Faculty Senators, and must apologize in advance for the names I will butcher:

#### *College of Arts & Sciences*

Re-elected: Travis Hreno, Jon Miller, Stacey Nofziger, Pam Schulze,  
Newly elected: Malena Espanol, Michael Shott, Julia Spiker, David Szalay, Juan Xi

#### *College of Health Professions*

Newly elected: Carrie Scotto

#### *College of Business*

Re-elected: John Matejkovic  
Newly elected: Mahesh Srninivasan

#### *College of Engineering*

Newly elected: Malik Elbuluk, Edward Evans, S. Graham Kelly, Jie Zheng

#### *Wayne College*

Newly elected: Amber Ferris – 2019 – completing term of Gatzia

#### *Polymer Science & Engineering*

Newly elected: Shi-Qing Wang – 2020 - completing term of Dhinojwala

*School of Law*

Re-elected: Dana Cole

Newly elected: John Sahl

*University Libraries*

Re-elected: Lori Fielding

*Advisors*

No representative yet.

*USG*

Newly elected: Taylor Bennington, Andrew Barry

*GSG*

Newly elected: Haiely Cargill

Congratulations and welcome. We still need Senators for the Advisors and Graduate Student Government. I would also like to introduce Bill Rich, our Parliamentarian, and Heather Loughney, Senate's administrative assistant and transcriber for this meeting.

Please note that the Faculty Senate is the legislative body of the faculty at the university level. Its meetings are relatively formal and are conducted according to its bylaws and Robert's Rules of Order. If you wish to address the body, please hold up your name tag so that the chair can read your name, and wait to be recognized. If I should fail to say your name (or butcher it) when recognizing you, please state it when you begin to speak so that your remarks may be properly attributed in the record (and I might learn your name). These meetings are transcribed. Please do not make noise that may make it difficult for the transcriber to hear the proceedings. When you speak, please speak loudly enough to be heard by all, and bear in mind that your remarks will be transcribed for all the world to read. Please address your remarks to the chair rather than directly to another member of the body, even if they are made in response to another member's remarks. This formality helps to avoid personalizing issues and to maintain civility.

If you have not already done so, please sign one of the posted attendance sheets so that your presence may be properly recorded.

This is a relatively large deliberative body with an Executive Committee and various committees that prepare legislation and informational reports for the Senate's consideration. Today we will be electing members to serve on the Executive Committee. Members of standing and ad hoc committees are appointed by the Executive Committee. Every senator is expected to serve on at least one Senate committee. Any new senators who have not already done so are urged to submit their committee preferences. We need more members on URC (University

Review Committee that is a subcommittee of CRC, Curriculum Review Committee) and APC (Academic Policies Committee).

The Senate has a number of representatives to the University Council and its standing committees. We will be voting to fill a two year term to UC. We have six vacant Faculty Senate seats on several UC standing committees (members to be appointed by FSEC): Communications, Physical Environment, Recreation & Wellness, Student Engagement & Success, and Talent Development & Human Resources. If you would be interested in serving on any of these committees, please let me know.

The University of Akron's Board of Trustees met on August 15th and approved recommendations from Interim President Green and Provost Ramsier regarding Academic Program Review. The result was to suspend admission and phase-out (i.e., cut) 10 Ph.D. programs, 33 master's programs, 20 bachelor's programs, and 17 associate degree programs. I would like to address four issues with this: process, graduate programs, fiscal responsibility and strategic planning.

Concerning the process, it fell short on shared governance. Quoting from the Resolution, "The president and provost have considered the Academic Program Review process in its entirety, including the evaluations from the faculty in each academic department/school, each department chair and school director, each dean, the Academic Program Review Committee, and the Faculty Senate." I do not recall any of these documents recommending, or even mentioning, suspending program admissions and phasing-out degrees. Faculty were not involved in the final decision making process. The three people who were consulted were the dean of the graduate school, the chief communication and marketing officer, and the chief financial officer. I believe the recommendation to cut programs should have come to this body, or at least it's executive committee.

Concerning the graduate programs, eighteen months ago this body approved a resolution that cut funding to terminal master's degree programs by 70%. That was very difficult to do, but was done to save Ph.D. programs. The August 15th Board resolution cuts half of our Ph.D. programs. I, and many of my colleagues, feel betrayed by this action.

Concerning fiscal responsibility, some of the programs that were cut have positive revenue, that is, they bring in more money than they cost. Why cut programs that make money when we have a large budgetary deficit?

Concerning strategic planning, Academic Program Review was done, again quoting the board resolution, "in order to form a baseline for university-wide strategic planning." If this was to be a baseline for strategic planning, it seems to me that cutting programs was premature, unless, of course, the administration has a strategic plan that we don't know about.

The university is starting the process of making a true strategic plan; one that is realistic and obtainable. I hope we will hear more about this from the president and/or provost. I will tell you that the process will mimic APR, starting with a steering committee of five, chaired by Chand Midha, with two representatives from the Senate's strategic planning committee (myself and Kris Kraft from CHP have been appointed by the FSEC), a representative from SEAC and another from

CPAC. I hope we find the results of this endeavor to be more satisfying than APR.

Along the lines of strategic planning, our Board of Trustees approved a resolution, on August 15th that deals with recommendations of possible academic reorganization. Quoting the resolution, “The president and provost recommend a campus-wide conversation on possible academic reorganizations through our academic shared governance processes during the fall 2018 semester,” with specific recommendations for academic reorganization to be presented to the Board at its meeting on December 5, 2018. This is a very short timeframe, and campus wide conversations haven’t begun. Interim President Green wants to talk to the units involved before making these ideas “public.” While it is appropriate to find out about such issues from the administration instead of students (as happened with some faculty regarding their program being cut), the current situation for many departments is one of severe anxiety, waiting to see if they will be affected. I encourage the administration to make their ideas public.

This concludes my remarks.

#### *IV. Special Announcements*

Randolph (Randy) Vipperman, age 61, passed away on August 27, 2018. He was born on May 22, 1957 in Wadsworth and was a 1976 graduate of Rittman High School. Randy earned his Bachelor’s degree from The University of Akron and Master’s degree from Case Western Reserve. He was an adult probation officer for Summit County and a social work lecturer at The University of Akron. He was also a substance abuse counselor with the Safety Forces Chaplaincy Center.

#### *V. Report of the Executive Committee*

The Executive Committee (EC) has met ten times since the last regular meeting.

In May the EC met three times. In the first meeting we discussed curriculum proposals and committee appointments. In the second meeting, with the President and Provost, we discussed a grading controversy in the College of Business Administration, interim chairs, the future of the College of Education, the University’s budget, admissions, part-time faculty benefits, the fire at the former Ballet Center, the four-day schedule, the upcoming sesquicentennial, and academic program review. At the end of May, the EC met to appoint members to the ad hoc Strategic Planning Committee. (39, p.119ff; 39, p.162ff)

In June the EC met twice. In the first meeting, we discussed a senate election, budget reductions, and the availability of our stenographer in the Fall. At the second meeting, with the Provost, we discussed the curriculum proposal system, the University’s budget, admissions, plans for the Ballet Center building and the Martin Center, academic program review, the University’s mission, faculty hires, the 5 percent decrease in operating budgets, administrative review, and the sesquicentennial celebration. (40, pp. 41ff)

The EC met twice in July. In the first meeting, we discussed upcoming committee appointments and certified a senate election. We then met with the

President and Provost and discussed the budget, admissions, academic program review, faculty hires, administrative review, athletics, and the future of the Ballet Center and the Martin Center. (43, pp. 123ff)

In August the EC met three times. In the first meeting, the EC certified an election and made a committee appointment. The EC also discussed the program recommendations approved by the Board of Trustees. In the second meeting, with the Provost, the EC discussed these outcomes of Academic Program Review. At the end of August the EC met to set an agenda for today's meeting and make committee appoints. Finally, the EC certified an election by email earlier this week.

This concludes my report.

Senator Randby asked what criteria for used for selection to the strategic planning committee and who was selected from CAST.

Chair Saliga said that being available over the summer and past work with administration were the factors and the Michelle Byrne was CAST's representation.

Senator Randby noted the Byrne was an administrator and Chair Saliga confirmed this.

#### *VI. Remarks of the President*

Interim President Green apologized in advance for making extended remarks.

He reported on Academic Program Review. He remarked that he began the process as the Dean of the College of Arts & Science, where there were challenges. He conceded that the University made up the process as we went along, but he also noted that the process produced much better results than he expected. He praised all the members of the University community, including the faculty, who were involved. At the end of the process, he found himself in the President's office charged with acting on these results.

He discovered that there were no set rules or expectations for what should have happened as a result of the APR process. He reflected that no one knew who would be the President at the end. In the spirit of the process to date, he made up a process. He began by instituting an Administrative Activities Review (AAR), at the urging of this body in May 2018.

He noted that the AAR reports are receiving the same level of scrutiny as the APR reports, and that this process is nearing its end.

The second thing he did was to set up a timetable to review the APR reports and make decisions. He read every page of all the documents -- some pages twice -- absorbing and interpreting all this information, which substantially was produced by faculty.

He noted that there were many complaints, many valid, about the data in APR. With Dr. Midha he straightened out the data, as best as they could.

The CFO helped clarify the fiscal impact of the decisions. He revealed two important things: first, that it was extremely unlikely that APR would have any affect on our financial situation. And this has been the case, to this day. APR was not principally about finances. Second, the CFO pointed out that there was a long-term possible effect on the budget by increasing enrollment through the growth of strategic investments.



The eighty programs to be phased out only enrolled about 5% of the student body. The other eighty percent enrolled ninety percent of students. So, he concluded, there is potential for greater revenue by repurposing revenues into popular programs that are well supported by the State.

A key provision of his decision was that there would be no layoffs. APR was not about reducing the resources given to the academic programs; it was about repurposing them. In some areas this will be easier than in others.

The other feature is that we needed to invest in growing programs immediately. As part of that process, we authorized the hiring of thirty faculty and one contract professional immediately. If the phaseouts go the way we anticipate, over three to five years, we will have about six million dollars of resources freed up. This will not be cash but will include faculty who can be repurposed.

Soon the process of reviewing the programs became an exercise between the President and the Provost. Once they had a good list, they met with each of the deans, confidentially, to discuss the decisions. The meetings were very candid and, President Green believes, successful. Changes were made based on those conversations.

There are some, including Chair Saliga, who feel that taking recommendations to the board without coming to this body first is a violation of shared governance. He disagrees and he asserted that there was no violation of shared governance. He maintained that the purpose of APR was to reallocate resources, all the way through, and the decisions were made on the basis of evidence provided by the faculty.

He cited two reasons for taking it straight to the board. One, it was extremely important to move onto strategic planning as soon as we could. What's at stake in the strategic plan is the fiscal year 2020 budget. FY20 will be a very critical year. We were not able to spend a semester debating the conclusions.

One of his complaints about the APR was that it was very difficult to interpret much of the data without strategic planning. He expressed his belief that it would have been better to do strategic planning before APR but this is not the hand we were dealt, and we will do it in the other order.

President Green explained that he looked at the APR results holistically. He studied evaluations that were not consistent with each other and evaluations that were not consistent with the data. He found his views of the University and the degree programs changing based on the reports. He ended up doubting some of the judgments that he had made as Dean, and he found this humbling.

The tough calls cut both ways. Some programs moved from looking doubtful to looking promising. Others moved from looking like they should stay to looking like they would not be appropriate to keep.

One reason these decisions were so hard is the fact that President Green has been here for thirty years and knew personally the people and hard work behind the programs to be phased out. He believes the decisions made as a result of program review are rational, data-driven and have a high prospect for success. He made the final calls. The Board accepted his decisions without alteration. He invited faculty to blame him, if they wish or feel a need to blame someone. On the other hand, if the faculty would like these decisions modified, the person they

need to persuade is President Green. He dissuaded faculty from going to the Board or a dean for remedy. Rational argument, data, and conversation persuade him. Other types of discourse will have no effect. He is very reluctant to ask the Board to reverse decisions barring a major factual error.

What if these decisions don't pan out? What is the remedy to adjust those decisions? The answer is the strategic planning process. An effective strategic planning process must allow for changes to curriculum. He reminded the faculty that no degree programs will be eliminated until all the students are taught out. All that has happened is the admission to the degree programs has been suspended. All of the programs phased out has significant weaknesses. If strategic planning can address these, he might be disposed to reverse decisions.

This fall, we will begin a regular process of program review. This will be a multi-year cycle of reviews in which one-fifth or one-sixth of all programs are reviewed each year. President Green shared that his disposition would be to return to the process as it was started in fall 2017, but he would confer with deans first.

President Green alluded to his list of questions that he offers to guide strategic planning (see Appendix A). It could be that there is a better way to address those questions than reorganization. He promised that any reorganization proposals would go through the shared governance process. He urged everyone to participate in strategic planning.

He described the strategic planning process. The Dean of the Library and Dr. Midha will co-chair a committee of six. The Senate will appoint two members; CPAC and CEAC will appoint members; and a student representative will make seven. The role of this steering committee will be to steer the process.

He conceded that if it takes into the new year to get a strategic plan, that would be okay. He said that we want a budget that resources a plan. He noted how this has never been the case at UA. He expressed his hope that this first plan would be a three-year plan, going from very detailed to fairly speculative. He imagined that every year we will update the plan. The goal is to begin the strategic planning process on October 1. It will include all of the university constituents.

He described his plans for the various committees. He said the University Council would be the final body to approve it.

What's at stake? A pessimistic take suggests we have a \$45M structural deficit. This is not new; we've had it for several years. By "structural deficit" President Green means that without making changes to what we do, our revenues will fall \$45M short. This is not sustainable. We have managed this deficit very well, in part through the clever use of one-time money. We had only a small deficit last year--only \$5 or \$6 million. We did this by not spending money. We cannot do this every year. This is not sustainable. We must determine what our priorities are and address them.

If we were to address this deficit in three years, we would either need to reduce expenditures by \$15M or increase revenues by \$15M. For a little while, we can use one-time money. But we cannot do this for long. A \$15M reduction is a lot of people. The net savings of the 2015 layoffs was \$16M. If we to do this

entirely out of people, there would need to be a very substantial reduction of people.

In his judgment, revenues will grow very, very slowly. The demographics that we face are not good. In the best-case scenario, our enrollment is flat next fall. Growth in enrollment appears to be further out. If enrollments continue to decline, however, we would be in serious trouble. We might need to declare portions of the University to be in financial exigency and the University would never recover from that.

So we need to make a lot of tough decisions. We need to work together to make sure the University not only survives, but thrives.

Chair Saliga requested that this room be repaired so that Deans do not fall into the floor.

President Green responded that the School of Music lobbies for its leaky roof.

President Green made himself available to answer questions.

Senator Randby introduced himself as a co-director of the cybersecurity program. He noted that he had worked on this for five years and conceded that he was pleased that cybersecurity was targeted for investment, but that the joint positions do not make sense. He heard of them first when the announcement was made about APR. What is the plan? How are these positions supposed to work?

President Green advised that we should hire the best people we can. The positions, he explained, were created with input from the deans. He recommended that Senator Randby speak with his dean. The joint positions will break down silos and get more bang for the buck. He has great admiration for the work in cybersecurity and he believes the joint positions will help. He has great faith in his cybersecurity faculty to find great people. President Green hoped that reorganization would also break down silos and wondered why there are multiple computer science departments on campus. Joint appointments would help to combine work in departments that might be merged as a result of reorganization.

Senator Nicholas responded that we do not have multiple computer science departments on campus. They are as different as night and day. He noted that these positions will not address the logjam at the beginning of their programs.

President Green responded that he would be disappointed if they were not able to use these positions to solve these problems. He noted that he understands these differences but reported that around the state people are amazed that we have two units doing what they regard as very similar things.

Senator Nofziger asked about the possibility of "declaring portions of the University" as in financial exigency. How, she asked, can only portions be in such a situation when University funding has long been a story of some units generating revenue to subsidize other units?

President Green answered that some of the units that have been heavily subsidized cannot be subsidized any longer.

A senator asked about the relationship between strategic planning and the Presidential search.

President Green answered that the Board is in charge of the search. Though loathe to speak for the Board, he explained that he believes they will hire a search firm and conduct surveys of University constituencies to gather information about

what the University needs. He expects the job will be posted in early 2019. He has told the Board that he would stay on a little longer, and repeated that he will not be a candidate for the position.

Senator Makki noted that some programs came out of APR with categories that contradict the results of APR.

President Green responded that he looked at enrollment, competition with neighboring Universities, and other data. The main goal of a recent compact made between institutions in Northeast Ohio was to move away from having duplicate programs.

*VII. Remarks of the Senior Vice President and Provost*

Provost Ramsier noted that community colleges have proposed four-year bachelor's degrees. Stark State proposed a BA in management accounting. There are eleven similar programs in Northeast Ohio, including here and at Kent. So all the deans of business colleges in Northeast Ohio submitted a co-signed letter as well as additional testimony. Because of this, we have been told that the Chancellor will reconsider the proposal and have a discussion about duplication.

Stark State, he noted, are here to stay. They are not our enemy. We have a dual admission agreement we are close to signing. We will be working with them on a much broader scale. The two plus two concept will become more and more important. He urged faculty to help review curriculum from other schools when asked.

He noted that enrollment is right on our projections, so our budget numbers will hold. He noted that Bill Kraus has returned. He noted that the University has now fully implemented the new admissions policy. In 2018 we had about four hundred preparatory students; this year we have zero. Some were deferred to Wayne, where personalized attention will get them ready to join the main campus. Also, we need to talk about offering bachelor's degrees and master's degrees at Wayne College.

He noted that they are tracking participation in five-star Fridays. He said he would sign up for Biology of Monsters were it not on Friday.

The decline of Saudi students has reduced enrollments for ELI and so we will see them reaching out.

He urged faculty to share study abroad ideas with Heather Pollock, a longtime visiting and part-time faculty member who will coordinate our study abroad program this year.

Finally, he noted that we have re-kindled ITL and have a Learning Commons run by Bill Lyons.

The Provost made himself available for questions.

The Provost noted that twenty-five students deferred to Wayne College.

Senator Nicholas asked for the number of students enrolled this fall.

Provost Ramsier responded twenty thousand and change. Final numbers would be available at census. He added that thirteen hundred of these students are CCP students. He noted that last year, fifty percent of CCP students applied for UA. Of those who were admitted, fifty percent attended. He described this as a very good yield and described CCP as a promising recruiting ground. If we give them a good experience, hopefully more of them will come here.

*VIII. Senate Elections**Vice Chair (1-year term)*

Senator Maaki nominated herself. Senator Foster moved that nominations be closed and Senator Maaki be elected Vice Chair. The motion was adopted.

*Secretary (1-year term)*

Senator Nofziger nominated Senator Howley. Senator Nicholas moved that nominations be closed and Senator Howley be elected Secretary. The motion was adopted.

*Executive Committee (2 seats, 2-year terms; 2 seats, 1-year terms)*

For the first seat, Senator Spiker nominated Senator Thornton. Senator Kidd moved that nominations be closed as Senator Spiker be elected. The motion was adopted.

For the second two-year term, Senator Hajjafar nominated Senator Roy. Senator Nicholas moved that nominations be closed and that Senator Roy be elected. The motion was adopted.

For the first of the one-year terms, Senator Foster nominated Senator Soucek. Senator Roy nominated Senator Schulze. Senator Nicholas moved that nominations be closed. The Senate voted by secret ballot. Senator Schulze received thirty votes. Senator Soucek received twelve votes. Senator Schulze was elected.

*Representatives to Graduate Council (2 representatives, 1-year terms)*

For the final term, Senator Nofziger was nominated. Senator Matejkovic moved that nominations be closed and Senator Nofziger be elected by acclamation. The motion was adopted.

Senator Foster nominated Senator Soucek for the first seat. Senator Matejkovic moved that nominations be closed and Senator Soucek be elected by acclamation. The motion was approved.

For the second seat on the Graduate Council, Senator Soucek nominated Senator Tessier. Senator Matekovic moved that nominations be closed and Senator Tessier be elected by acclamation. The motion was adopted.

*University Council (1 seat on council, 2-year term)*

Senator Kelly nominated Senator Evans. Senator Foster moved that nominations be closed and Senator Kelly be elected by acclamation. The motion was adopted.

*IX. Committee Reports*

A. General Education Advisory Committee

Senator Barrett presented a course for approval (see Appendix B). The motion was adopted.

B. Academic Policies Committee

Senator Klein reported that APC met two days ago and plans to offer a report on program review and other items at the October meeting.

C. ad hoc Strategic Planning Committee

Chair Saliga reported that the strategic planning committee met on June 29th and elected Linda Saliga as chair. Many ideas about what our university should look like were discussed.

We met again on July 20th. It was decided to wait until after the August 15th board meeting to get too involved with ideas.

We met on August 17th, discussing the Board's action.

Our fourth meeting of the summer was on August 23rd with Interim President Green and Provost Ramsier. Since the strategic planning committee is made up of representatives from each college, it was decided that this committee will work as liaisons between the colleges and the strategic planning steering committee.

*X. Report of the University Council Representatives - Senators Roy & Allen*

Senator Roy reported that the UC met twice over the summer. The July meeting was cancelled for low enrollment. The June meeting was inconsequential. In August the discussion was on the results of program review. Provost Ramsier and Interim President Green gave remarks much like the ones they gave today.

*XI. New Business*

There was no new business.

*XII. Good of the Order*

There was nothing for the good of the order.

*XIII. Adjournment*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm.

—Heather Howley, Secretary.

Questions and comments about the minutes can be emailed to [hhowley@uakron.edu](mailto:hhowley@uakron.edu) or called in to x8958.

APPENDIX A  
**Questions that might be  
Answered by Reorganization (8-28-18)**

Student Recruitment and Success

1. How do we help undergraduates find the appropriate degree early in their college career and thus reduce the number of students that drop out without a degree?
2. How do we improve student retention, persistence and graduation rates in all degree programs, especially in areas of strength and distinction?
3. How do we maximize attracting students into polymer and chemical sciences degrees?
4. How do we maximize attracting students into engineering and engineering technology degrees?
5. How do we maximize attracting students into computing, cybersecurity and data analytics degrees?
6. How do we maximize attracting students into health profession and biological sciences degrees?

Efficiency and Effectiveness

1. How do we efficiently and effectively run academic units which have a small number of faculty?
2. How do we efficiently and effectively run degree granting colleges?
3. How do we offer bachelors and masters degrees at our branch campus and additional locations, while ensuring consistency, quality, and rigor?
4. How do we best administer partnerships with public schools, such as “sister” schools and College Credit Plus?

Financial Considerations

1. How do we institute consistent tuition across the main campus, branch campus, and additional locations?
2. How do we ensure that all degree programs maximize net tuition revenue and minimize program expenditures?
3. How do we ensure that all degree programs maximize SSI revenue and minimize program expenditures?
4. How do we make sponsored research financially sustainable without subsidies from the general fund?
5. How do we make scholarships and waivers sustainable while minimizing subsidies from the general fund?

APPENDIX B  
GEAC Senate Report

August 30, 2018

Submitted by Linda Barrett, GEAC member

The General Education Advisory Committee submits the following course for Faculty Senate approval, which was mistakenly left off the list submitted at the previous meeting. As an existing course, this course went through the “fast-track” process rather than through the curriculum proposal system. GEAC has approved this course and has verified that it has also received departmental approval.

APPROVE

3300:362 World Literatures -- Global Diversity